

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 14, 2004 has been read and carefully considered and the present amendment submitted in order to better describe the present invention in order to distinguish the differences thereof over the cited references. In addition, an extension of time of one month for responding to the Office Action is hereby petitioned and the fee for that extension accompanies this Amendment.

In that Office Action, claims 1-6 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg *et al*, U.S. Patent 6,296,606 in view of Patel, U.S. Patent 4,331,161. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as begin unpatentable over Goldberg *et al* in view of Patel and further in view of Koch, U.S. Patent 6,048,304.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13 to better define that the input signals used in Applicant's invention are specifically two different predetermined voltage signals and thus more fully distinguish over the disclosure of the of Goldberg *et al* reference.

The input signals of Goldberg are provided by temperature sensors whereas the input signals of Applicant's invention are different signals and are predetermined, set and known values in order to carry out the calibration steps. Thus, with the aforementioned amendments to claim 1 and 13, Applicant has described those input voltage signals as different and also predetermined since those input voltage signals are established, predetermined and not some signals that may be provided by the sensing of a temperature. Voltage signals from temperature sensors such as are used in Goldberg *et al* are not predetermined but are dependent totally on the sensed temperature that may, and most likely will, change.

The amendment is believed to better show the substantial difference in the Goldberg *et al* disclosure vs. the present method since, in the present method, inputs two different but predetermined voltages are inputted to determine the output voltages based on the individual, different input voltages. The input signals of Goldberg *et al* are not

predetermined but vary depending on the particular sensed temperature and those input signals could certainly not be used in the manner that Applicant is using the two different, predetermined voltage inputs to calibrate the circuit by determining the differing output signals and then using those output signals to calculate the offset and span constants in order to use those constants to calibrate the circuit.

As stated, there is no indication in Goldberg *et al* that the offset and span constants are being calculated or are at all determined and, absent that teaching, it is likely that the calibration of the Goldberg *et al* circuit was carried out by the use of potentiometers as is conventional in such calibrations. In any event, there is no teaching in Goldberg *et al* to use the two different, predetermined input voltages to calculate the offset and span constants and to thereafter use those constants to calibrate the electrical circuit.

With no relevant teaching in the principal reference, the additional disclosures of Patel and Koch do not add any pertinent information to the principal reference to turn the temperature determination circuitry of Goldberg *et al* into a calibration system where there are no different, predetermined voltage signals inputted in the Goldberg *et al* reference and therefore, no way to obtain output signals that can be used to determine the offset and span constants for calibration of the circuit.

Accordingly, the claims in this application are submitted as patentable over the references of record and an allowance of the present application is respectfully solicited.



Respectfully submitted:

Roger M. Rathbun

Attorney for Applicant

Registration 24, 964